

13. (Cancelled)
14. (Original) The equipment of claim 2, wherein the extracellular fluid is an interstitial fluid.
15. (Original) The equipment of claim 3, wherein the extracellular fluid is an interstitial fluid.
16. (Original) The equipment of claim 4, wherein the extracellular fluid is an interstitial fluid.
17. (Original) The equipment of claim 5, wherein the extracellular fluid is an interstitial fluid.
18. (Original) The equipment of claim 6, wherein the extracellular fluid is an interstitial fluid.

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 are pending in the application. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been cancelled. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter.

In the Office Action, the Abstract was objected to as being too lengthy. The Abstract has been amended in a manner believed to be fully responsive to the Examiner's concerns. The disclosure was objected to because the term "extracellular fluid change computing means" was referred to as reference numeral (23), and as reference numeral (26), in two different places in the text. This was caused by a typographical error on page 22, lines 25-26. The specification

has been amended to eliminate the error and uniformly refer to “extracellular fluid change computing means (26)”.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite due to the use of the term “i.e.” in line 9. This term has been eliminated. Applicants believe this amendment is fully responsive to the Examiner’s concerns.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.5,701,894 (Cherry et al). Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherry et al in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0007055 (Fukuda et al.). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherry et al in view of Fukuda et al., further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0020138 (Ishigooka et al.). These rejections are moot, since claims 1, 7, and 13 have been cancelled.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 1), but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the §112 rejection of claim 4. Claims 2 and 4 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their base claim 1. Additionally, claim 4 has been amended to overcome the §112 rejection, as discussed hereinabove.

Therefore, amended claims 2 and 4 are patentable, as are claims 3, 5, 6, 8-12 and 14-18, which depend from claims 2 and 4, respectively.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina

Registration No. 33,424

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM:idw  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: May 15, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**